

(June 13, 2016) Public Hearing Minutes
Steamboat Lake Water & Sanitation District Public Hearing
6-13-16

Meeting called to order at 6:08pm at the North Routt Community Charter School
by Jim Finegan.

Members present:

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. <u>Jim Finegan</u> | 2. <u>Kathleen Titus</u> |
| 3. <u>Jim Hillman</u> | 4. <u>Dave Entwistle</u> |
| 5. <u>Bob Hulton</u> | |

Members absent:

None

Others present:

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. <u>Jackie Johnson, SLWSD Admin Asst</u> | 2. <u>Steve Johnson , video</u> |
| 3. <u>Rich Tremaine, SLWSD Legal Counsel</u> | 4. <u>Elizabeth Roble, Legal Counsel</u> |
| 5. <u>Cathy Rowe</u> | 6. <u>James Rowe</u> |
| 7. <u>Chris Kramer</u> | 8. <u>Bonnie Murray</u> |
| 9. <u>Greg Murray</u> | 10. <u>Robert Hagerty</u> |
| 11. <u>Dave Peregoy</u> | 12. <u>Lanny Mack</u> |
| 13. <u>Lee Emery</u> | 14. <u>Tim Wright</u> |
| 15. <u>Keith Hussey</u> | 16. <u></u> |

Agenda:

Public Hearing regarding 12 applicants requesting exclusion from Steamboat Lake Water and Sanitation District.

Open Issues:

Board president Jim Finegan called the meeting to order at 6:08pm, Board member and staff introductions were made. Per Jim F.: "Tonight the Board is holding its first public hearing in many years for the purpose of considering several requests from property owners, asking that their properties be excluded from the Steamboat Lake Water and Sanitation District. The Board

has approved some preliminary application procedures and will be considering these requests under the criteria that have been established by the State of Colorado.

We have worked diligently with our attorneys and staff to develop what we hope will be an efficient review process, to allow us to reach decisions where we have sufficient information. We appreciate your patience and understanding that tonight's hearings are the first ones for us and we will be proceeding cautiously to try to be sure that everyone's interests are considered and to be sure we follow the guidelines set by the Colorado state legislature.

I will be announcing the names of the applicants for each request that we are considering tonight; asking for a brief summary from our staff, and; providing an opportunity for the applicant and for interested parties to provide information to us for the record, and; then looking to the Board for appropriate action. At that point, the Board will discuss the application and it may request more information, may continue the hearing on the application to another date, may go into executive/private session for consideration of legal issues, or may take some preliminary action on the application.

The following items are provided in the back of the room for everyone to review: a map of the Steamboat Lake Water and Sanitation District, a chart of the process, a criteria form that details C.R.S. 32-1-501(3) factors the board is using to arrive at their decision, and an objection form for anyone interested in filling out and submitting. These forms are all a part of the record. Please note that this proceeding is being recorded and minutes will be available.

- 1-1. The Public Hearing is being started **for Robert K. Hagerty and Laura H. G. Wait.**
- 1-2. Rich Tremaine, attorney for SLWSD, summarizes the application information:
Lots 13 & 14 in Parkside subdivision, Filing 6. Lot 13 is 5.03 acres, Lot 14 is 5.02 acres. Annual tax is \$0.40 for each lot for a total of \$0.80. Both lots are vacant.
- 1-3. Applicant, Robert Hagerty, is present and provides a brief summary of his petition to be excluded from the district. He also has submitted support documents for the record.
- 1-4. When asked if any supporter of this application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record it was decided that a show of hands in favor of this application is appropriate. 11 public members in attendance are in favor of the application.
- 1-5. When asked if any opponents of the application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record no opposition is noted.
- 1-6. When asked if anyone else wants to speak on the application or any other submittals for the record no further comments are submitted. President Jim F. closes the public hearing and turns to the Board for any questions that the Board members may have and to discuss the application.

Per C.R.S. 32-1-501(3)

The Board will make a motion based on the findings on these factors:

A-1. The best interest of the (applicant's) property to be excluded is:

The board's findings > To be excluded, because: District has no plan to provide service; development on well and septic would not harm District.

A-2. The best interest of the District is:

The board's findings > For the Property to be excluded, because: Property is remote from District services.

A-3. The best interest of the County is:

The board's findings> For the Property to be excluded, because: County has determined that property does not need public services.

B. Relative cost and benefit to the Property to be excluded from District:

The board's findings> Benefit, slightly lower tax bill.

C. Ability of the District to provide economical and sufficient service to the Property requesting exclusion; to all of the properties in the District:

The board's findings> None to property at present, none in current District plans, would require major change; plan; financing.

D. District ability to provide services at a reasonable cost compared to other entities' ability to provide such services:

The board's findings> District is only entity with ability to provide, unless County finances/policies change.

E. Effect of denying the petition on employment/other economic conditions in the District and surrounding area:

The board's findings> Denial of the petition would continue the status quo; no effect anticipated.

F. Economic impact (on District, surrounding area, state) if petition approved or denied:

The board's findings> If approved, less tax revenue to District; possible increase in tax to other District lots

G. Whether there is an economically feasible alternative service:

The board's findings> No feasible alternative public service provider is known to be available.

H. Additional cost to be levied on other property in the District if exclusion is granted:

The board's findings> Annual tax loss if exclusion is \$ 0.80. (Cumulative cost is to be considered.)

BASED UPON THESE FINDINGS, and other points made in Board discussion, Jim F. moves that we direct our counsel to prepare an Order to **APPROVE** the Petitioner's request for exclusion for the designated property. Jim H. seconds the motion, four approve, one opposed siting loss of revenue to the District, motion carried.

- 2-1. The Public Hearing is being started for **Haveron Family Trust 8/1/2009 Earnest Daniel Haveron, Trustee & Charleen Ann Haveron, Trustee.**
- 2-2. Rich Tremaine, attorney for SLWSD, summarizes the application information: Lot 2 Aspen Heights subdivision, Filing 6, 5.09 acres, property is developed with a home, well, and septic. Current amount of annual tax is \$209.62.
- 2-3. Applicant is not present; written documentation has been submitted indicating Gregory Murray as applicant's authorized representative. The applicant has submitted support documents for the record. Testimony is repetitive in nature. Board member Kathleen Titus addresses the petitioner's comments presented in the letter of support regarding SLWSD board eligibility stating that section 8.1 of the rules and regulations has been updated to reflect eligibility as of February 2016 regular board meeting. Bob Hulton adds that eligibility was never an issue due to lack of volunteers coming forth to serve. Once it was brought to the board's attention it was addressed.
- 2-4. When asked if any supporter of this application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record it was decided that a show of hands in favor of this application is appropriate. 11 public members in attendance are in favor of the application.
- 2-5. When asked if any opponents of the application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record no opposition is noted.
- 2-6. When asked if anyone else wants to speak on the application or any other submittals for the record no further comments are submitted. President Jim F. closes the public

hearing and turns to the Board for any questions that the Board members may have and to discuss the application.

Per C.R.S. 32-1-501(3)

The Board will make a motion based on the findings on these factors:

A-1. The best interest of the (applicant's) property to be excluded is:

The board's findings > To be excluded, because: District has no plan to provide service; development on well and septic would not harm District.

A-2. The best interest of the District is:

The board's findings > For the Property to be excluded, because: Property is remote from District services.

A-3. The best interest of the County is:

The board's findings> For the Property to be excluded, because: County has determined that property does not need public services.

B. Relative cost and benefit to the Property to be excluded from District:

The board's findings> Benefit, slightly lower tax bill.

C. Ability of the District to provide economical and sufficient service to the Property requesting exclusion; to all of the properties in the District:

The board's findings> None to property at present, none in current District plans, would require major change; plan; financing.

D. District ability to provide services at a reasonable cost compared to other entities' ability to provide such services:

The board's findings> District is only entity with ability to provide, unless County finances/policies change.

E. Effect of denying the petition on employment/other economic conditions in the District and surrounding area:

The board's findings> Denial of the petition would continue the status quo; no effect anticipated.

F. Economic impact (on District, surrounding area, state) if petition approved or denied:

The board's findings> If approved, less tax revenue to District; possible increase in tax to other District lots

G. Whether there is an economically feasible alternative service:

The board's findings> No feasible alternative public service provider is known to be available.

H. Additional cost to be levied on other property in the District if exclusion is granted:

The board's findings> Annual tax loss if exclusion is \$ 209.62. (Cumulative cost is to be considered.)

BASED UPON THESE FINDINGS, and other points made in Board discussion, Dave moves that we direct our counsel to prepare an Order to **APPROVE** the Petitioner's request for exclusion for the designated property. Jim F. seconds the motion, four approve, one opposed citing loss of revenue to the District, motion carried.

3-1. The Public Hearing is being started for **Richard S. Himes & Dorothy Bassett**.

3-2. Rich Tremaine, attorney for SLWSD, summarizes the application information: Lot 1 Aspen Heights subdivision, Filing 3 is 5.04 acres, tax amount is \$304.21; and Lot 282 Filing 7 which is .37 acres with tax amount of \$0.07; these lots are adjoining.

3-3. Applicant is not present, a complete application was submitted, no specific statement of support was submitted.

- 3-4. When asked if any supporter of this application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record it was decided that a show of hands in favor of this application is appropriate. 11 public members in attendance are in favor of the application.
- 3-5. When asked if any opponents of the application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record no opposition is noted.
- 3-6. When asked if anyone else wants to speak on the application or any other submittals for the record no further comments are submitted. President Jim F. closes the public hearing and turns to the Board for any questions that the Board members may have and to discuss the application.

Per C.R.S. 32-1-501(3)

The Board will make a motion based on the findings on these factors:

A-1. The best interest of the (applicant's) property to be excluded is:

The board's findings > To be excluded, because: District has no plan to provide service; development on well and septic would not harm District.

A-2. The best interest of the District is:

The board's findings > For the Property to be excluded, because: Property is remote from District services.

A-3. The best interest of the County is:

The board's findings> For the Property to be excluded, because: County has determined that property does not need public services.

B. Relative cost and benefit to the Property to be excluded from District:

The board's findings> Benefit, slightly lower tax bill.

C. Ability of the District to provide economical and sufficient service to the Property requesting exclusion; to all of the properties in the District:

The board's findings> None to property at present, none in current District plans, would require major change; plan; financing.

D. District ability to provide services at a reasonable cost compared to other entities' ability to provide such services:

The board's findings> District is only entity with ability to provide, unless County finances/policies change.

E. Effect of denying the petition on employment/other economic conditions in the District and surrounding area:

The board's findings> Denial of the petition would continue the status quo; no effect anticipated.

F. Economic impact (on District, surrounding area, state) if petition approved or denied:

The board's findings> If approved, less tax revenue to District; possible increase in tax to other District lots

G. Whether there is an economically feasible alternative service:

The board's findings> No feasible alternative public service provider is known to be available.

H. Additional cost to be levied on other property in the District if exclusion is granted:

The board's findings> Annual tax loss if exclusion is \$ 304.28. (Cumulative cost is to be considered.)

BASED UPON THESE FINDINGS, and other points made in Board discussion, Kathleen moves that we direct our counsel to prepare an Order to **APPROVE** the Petitioner's request for exclusion for the designated property. Jim H. seconds the motion, four approve, one opposed sitting loss of revenue to the District, motion carried.

- 4-1. The Public Hearing is being started for **Joanne M. Hussey Revocable Trust of 1999 Keith Hussey, Trustee.**
- 4-2. Rich Tremaine, attorney for SLWSD, summarizes the application information: Lot 1 Aspen Heights subdivision Filing 2; 5.05 acres with annual tax of \$325.99, residence located on this lot; Lot 308 Filing 7 which is .90 acre, vacant, and adjoins Lot 1 with annual tax of \$8.73.
- 4-3. Applicant is present, gives brief verbal testimony siting repetitive reasons for exclusion and also submits written documents for the record.
- 4-4. When asked if any supporter of this application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record it was decided that a show of hands in favor of this application is appropriate. 11 public members in attendance are in favor of the application.
- 4-5. When asked if any opponents of the application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record no opposition is noted.
- 4-6. When asked if anyone else wants to speak on the application or any other submittals for the record no further comments are submitted. President Jim F. closes the public hearing and turns to the Board for any questions that the Board members may have and to discuss the application.

Per C.R.S. 32-1-501(3)

The Board will make a motion based on the findings on these factors:

A-1. The best interest of the (applicant's) property to be excluded is:

The board's findings > To be excluded, because: District has no plan to provide service; development on well and septic would not harm District.

A-2. The best interest of the District is:

The board's findings > For the Property to be excluded, because: Property is remote from District services.

A-3. The best interest of the County is:

The board's findings> For the Property to be excluded, because: County has determined that property does not need public services.

B. Relative cost and benefit to the Property to be excluded from District:

The board's findings> Benefit, slightly lower tax bill.

C. Ability of the District to provide economical and sufficient service to the Property requesting exclusion; to all of the properties in the District:

The board's findings> None to property at present, none in current District plans, would require major change; plan; financing.

D. District ability to provide services at a reasonable cost compared to other entities' ability to provide such services:

The board's findings> District is only entity with ability to provide, unless County finances/policies change.

E. Effect of denying the petition on employment/other economic conditions in the District and surrounding area:

The board's findings> Denial of the petition would continue the status quo; no effect anticipated.

F. Economic impact (on District, surrounding area, state) if petition approved or denied:

The board's findings> If approved, less tax revenue to District; possible increase in tax to other District lots

G. Whether there is an economically feasible alternative service:

The board's findings> No feasible alternative public service provider is known to be available.

H. Additional cost to be levied on other property in the District if exclusion is granted:

The board's findings> Annual tax loss if exclusion is \$ 334.72. (Cumulative cost is to be considered.)

BASED UPON THESE FINDINGS, and other points made in Board discussion, Jim H. moves that we direct our counsel to prepare an Order to **APPROVE** the Petitioner's request for exclusion for the designated property. Jim F. seconds the motion, four approve, one opposed siting loss of revenue to the District, motion carried.

- 5-1. The Public Hearing is being started for **Douglas G. Kenyon & Amy Smith-Kenyon**.
- 5-2. Rich Tremaine, attorney for SLWSD, summarizes the application information: Lot 1 Elkhorn Subdivision Filing 1, 5.01 acres with residence on property, total annual tax is \$259.49.
- 5-3. Applicant is not present, Tim Wright submits written support on the Kenyon's behalf for the record.
- 5-4. When asked if any supporter of this application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record it was decided that a show of hands in favor of this application is appropriate. 11 public members in attendance are in favor of the application.
- 5-5. When asked if any opponents of the application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record no opposition is noted.
- 5-6. When asked if anyone else wants to speak on the application or any other submittals for the record no further comments are submitted. President Jim F. closes the public hearing and turns to the Board for any questions that the Board members may have and to discuss the application.

Per C.R.S. 32-1-501(3)

The Board will make a motion based on the findings on these factors:

A-1. The best interest of the (applicant's) property to be excluded is:

The board's findings > To be excluded, because: District has no plan to provide service; development on well and septic would not harm District.

A-2. The best interest of the District is:

The board's findings > For the Property to be excluded, because: Property is remote from District services.

A-3. The best interest of the County is:

The board's findings> For the Property to be excluded, because: County has determined that property does not need public services.

B. Relative cost and benefit to the Property to be excluded from District:

The board's findings> Benefit, slightly lower tax bill.

C. Ability of the District to provide economical and sufficient service to the Property requesting exclusion; to all of the properties in the District:

The board's findings> None to property at present, none in current District plans, would require major change; plan; financing.

D. District ability to provide services at a reasonable cost compared to other entities' ability to provide such services:

The board's findings> District is only entity with ability to provide, unless County finances/policies change.

E. Effect of denying the petition on employment/other economic conditions in the District and surrounding area:

The board's findings> Denial of the petition would continue the status quo; no effect anticipated.

F. Economic impact (on District, surrounding area, state) if petition approved or denied:

The board's findings> If approved, less tax revenue to District; possible increase in tax to other District lots

G. Whether there is an economically feasible alternative service:

The board's findings> No feasible alternative public service provider is known to be available.

H. Additional cost to be levied on other property in the District if exclusion is granted:

The board's findings> Annual tax loss if exclusion is \$ 259.49. (Cumulative cost is to be considered.)

BASED UPON THESE FINDINGS, and other points made in Board discussion, Jim H. moves that we direct our counsel to prepare an Order to **APPROVE** the Petitioner's request for exclusion for the designated property. Jim F. seconds the motion, four approve, one opposed siting loss of revenue to the District, motion carried.

- 6-1. The Public Hearing is being started for **Jeffrey J. Kozy & Mary A. Kozy**.
- 6-2. Rich Tremaine, attorney for SLWSD, summarizes the application information: Lot 8 Parkside subdivision filing 6, 5.03 acres, annual tax amount of \$212.42.
- 6-3. Applicant is not present, no specific statements of support are submitted.
- 6-4. When asked if any supporter of this application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record it was decided that a show of hands in favor of this application is appropriate. 11 public members in attendance are in favor of the application.
- 6-5. When asked if any opponents of the application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record no opposition is noted.
- 6-6. When asked if anyone else wants to speak on the application or any other submittals for the record no further comments are submitted. President Jim F. closes the public hearing and turns to the Board for any questions that the Board members may have and to discuss the application.

Per C.R.S. 32-1-501(3)

The Board will make a motion based on the findings on these factors:

A-1. The best interest of the (applicant's) property to be excluded is:

The board's findings > To be excluded, because: District has no plan to provide service; development on well and septic would not harm District.

A-2. The best interest of the District is:

The board's findings > For the Property to be excluded, because: Property is remote from District services.

A-3. The best interest of the County is:

The board's findings> For the Property to be excluded, because: County has determined that property does not need public services.

B. Relative cost and benefit to the Property to be excluded from District:

The board's findings> Benefit, slightly lower tax bill.

C. Ability of the District to provide economical and sufficient service to the Property requesting exclusion; to all of the properties in the District:

The board's findings> None to property at present, none in current District plans, would require major change; plan; financing.

D. District ability to provide services at a reasonable cost compared to other entities' ability to provide such services:

The board's findings> District is only entity with ability to provide, unless County finances/policies change.

E. Effect of denying the petition on employment/other economic conditions in the District and surrounding area:

The board's findings> Denial of the petition would continue the status quo; no effect anticipated.

F. Economic impact (on District, surrounding area, state) if petition approved or denied:

The board's findings> If approved, less tax revenue to District; possible increase in tax to other District lots

G. Whether there is an economically feasible alternative service:

The board's findings> No feasible alternative public service provider is known to be available.

H. Additional cost to be levied on other property in the District if exclusion is granted:

The board's findings> Annual tax loss if exclusion is \$ 212.42. (Cumulative cost is to be considered.)

BASED UPON THESE FINDINGS, and other points made in Board discussion, Dave moves that we direct our counsel to prepare an Order to **APPROVE** the Petitioner's request for exclusion for the designated property. Kathleen seconds the motion, four approve, one opposed siting loss of revenue to the District, motion carried.

- 7-1. The Public Hearing is being started for **Roxanne M. Lange**.
- 7-2. Rich Tremaine, attorney for SLWSD, summarizes the application information: Lot 6 Elkhorn subdivision filing 2, 5.78 acres, annual tax amount of \$225.34.
- 7-3. Applicant is not present, no specific statements of support are submitted.
- 7-4. When asked if any supporter of this application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record it was decided that a show of hands in favor of this application is appropriate. 11 public members in attendance are in favor of the application.
- 7-5. When asked if any opponents of the application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record no opposition is noted.
- 7-6. When asked if anyone else wants to speak on the application or any other submittals for the record no further comments are submitted. President Jim F. closes the public hearing and turns to the Board for any questions that the Board members may have and to discuss the application.

Per C.R.S. 32-1-501(3)

The Board will make a motion based on the findings on these factors:

A-1. The best interest of the (applicant's) property to be excluded is:

The board's findings > To be excluded, because: District has no plan to provide service; development on well and septic would not harm District.

A-2. The best interest of the District is:

The board's findings > For the Property to be excluded, because: Property is remote from District services.

A-3. The best interest of the County is:

The board's findings> For the Property to be excluded, because: County has determined that property does not need public services.

B. Relative cost and benefit to the Property to be excluded from District:

The board's findings> Benefit, slightly lower tax bill.

C. Ability of the District to provide economical and sufficient service to the Property requesting exclusion; to all of the properties in the District:

The board's findings> None to property at present, none in current District plans, would require major change; plan; financing.

D. District ability to provide services at a reasonable cost compared to other entities' ability to provide such services:

The board's findings> District is only entity with ability to provide, unless County finances/policies change.

E. Effect of denying the petition on employment/other economic conditions in the District and surrounding area:

The board's findings> Denial of the petition would continue the status quo; no effect anticipated.

F. Economic impact (on District, surrounding area, state) if petition approved or denied:

The board's findings> If approved, less tax revenue to District; possible increase in tax to other District lots

G. Whether there is an economically feasible alternative service:

The board's findings> No feasible alternative public service provider is known to be available.

H. Additional cost to be levied on other property in the District if exclusion is granted:

The board's findings> Annual tax loss if exclusion is \$ 225.34. (Cumulative cost is to be considered.)

BASED UPON THESE FINDINGS, and other points made in Board discussion, Jim F. moves that we direct our counsel to prepare an Order to **APPROVE** the Petitioner's request for exclusion for the designated property. Kathleen seconds the motion, four approve, one opposed siting loss of revenue to the District, motion carried.

- 8-1. The Public Hearing is being started for **John R. Mader & Pamela Mader**.
- 8-2. Rich Tremaine, attorney for SLWSD, summarizes the application information: Lot 3 Parkside subdivision filing 6, 5.16 acres, annual tax amount of \$228.01.
- 8-3. Applicant is not present, statements of support have been submitted for the record as well as written authorization for Greg Murray to speak on behalf of the Mader's. Per Mr. Murray, testimony is repetitive of all previous applicants.
- 8-4. When asked if any supporter of this application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record it was decided that a show of hands in favor of this application is appropriate. 11 public members in attendance are in favor of the application.
- 8-5. When asked if any opponents of the application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record no opposition is noted.
- 8-6. When asked if anyone else wants to speak on the application or any other submittals for the record no further comments are submitted. President Jim F. closes the public hearing and turns to the Board for any questions that the Board members may have and to discuss the application.

Per C.R.S. 32-1-501(3)

The Board will make a motion based on the findings on these factors:

A-1. The best interest of the (applicant's) property to be excluded is:

The board's findings > To be excluded, because: District has no plan to provide service; development on well and septic would not harm District.

A-2. The best interest of the District is:

The board's findings > For the Property to be excluded, because: Property is remote from District services.

A-3. The best interest of the County is:

The board's findings> For the Property to be excluded, because: County has determined that property does not need public services.

B. Relative cost and benefit to the Property to be excluded from District:

The board's findings> Benefit, slightly lower tax bill.

C. Ability of the District to provide economical and sufficient service to the Property requesting exclusion; to all of the properties in the District:

The board's findings> None to property at present, none in current District plans, would require major change; plan; financing.

D. District ability to provide services at a reasonable cost compared to other entities' ability to provide such services:

The board's findings> District is only entity with ability to provide, unless County finances/policies change.

E. Effect of denying the petition on employment/other economic conditions in the District and surrounding area:

The board's findings> Denial of the petition would continue the status quo; no effect anticipated.

F. Economic impact (on District, surrounding area, state) if petition approved or denied:

The board's findings> If approved, less tax revenue to District; possible increase in tax to other District lots

G. Whether there is an economically feasible alternative service:

The board's findings> No feasible alternative public service provider is known to be available.

H. Additional cost to be levied on other property in the District if exclusion is granted:

The board's findings> Annual tax loss if exclusion is \$ 228.01. (Cumulative cost is to be considered.)

BASED UPON THESE FINDINGS, and other points made in Board discussion, Dave moves that we direct our counsel to prepare an Order to **APPROVE** the Petitioner's request for exclusion for the designated property. Jim F. seconds the motion, four approve, one opposed siting loss of revenue to the District, motion carried.

- 9-1. The Public Hearing is being started for **Dan Mastbergen & Jessica Marlowe**.
- 9-2. Rich Tremaine, attorney for SLWSD, summarizes the application information: Lot 3 Aspen Heights subdivision filing 7, 5.02 acres, annual tax amount of \$0.27; property is currently in agricultural status. Per Mr. Greg Murray there is a well on the property.
- 9-3. Applicant is not present, statements of support are in the record.
- 9-4. When asked if any supporter of this application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record it was decided that a show of hands in favor of this application is appropriate. 11 public members in attendance are in favor of the application.
- 9-5. When asked if any opponents of the application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record no opposition is noted.
- 9-6. When asked if anyone else wants to speak on the application or any other submittals for the record no further comments are submitted. President Jim F. closes the public hearing and turns to the Board for any questions that the Board members may have and to discuss the application.

Per C.R.S. 32-1-501(3)

The Board will make a motion based on the findings on these factors:

A-1. The best interest of the (applicant's) property to be excluded is:

The board's findings > To be excluded, because: District has no plan to provide service; development on well and septic would not harm District.

A-2. The best interest of the District is:

The board's findings > For the Property to be excluded, because: Property is remote from District services.

A-3. The best interest of the County is:

The board's findings> For the Property to be excluded, because: County has determined that property does not need public services.

B. Relative cost and benefit to the Property to be excluded from District:

The board's findings> Benefit, slightly lower tax bill.

C. Ability of the District to provide economical and sufficient service to the Property requesting exclusion; to all of the properties in the District:

The board's findings> None to property at present, none in current District plans, would require major change; plan; financing.

D. District ability to provide services at a reasonable cost compared to other entities' ability to provide such services:

The board's findings> District is only entity with ability to provide, unless County finances/policies change.

E. Effect of denying the petition on employment/other economic conditions in the District and surrounding area:

The board's findings> Denial of the petition would continue the status quo; no effect anticipated.

F. Economic impact (on District, surrounding area, state) if petition approved or denied:

The board's findings> If approved, less tax revenue to District; possible increase in tax to other District lots

G. Whether there is an economically feasible alternative service:

The board's findings> No feasible alternative public service provider is known to be available.

H. Additional cost to be levied on other property in the District if exclusion is granted:

The board's findings> Annual tax loss if exclusion is \$ 0.27. (Cumulative cost is to be considered.)

BASED UPON THESE FINDINGS, and other points made in Board discussion, Kathleen moves that we direct our counsel to prepare an Order to **APPROVE** the Petitioner's request for exclusion for the designated property. Jim F. seconds the motion, four approve, one opposed siting loss of revenue to the District, motion carried.

- 10-1. The Public Hearing is being started for **Gregory T. Murray & Bonnie B. Murray**.
- 10-2. Rich Tremaine, attorney for SLWSD, summarizes the application information: Lot 11 Parkside subdivision filing 6, 5.49 acres, annual tax amount of \$302.68.
- 10-3. Applicant is present, statements of support are submitted for the record.
- 10-4. When asked if any supporter of this application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record it was decided that a show of hands in favor of this application is appropriate. 11 public members in attendance are in favor of the application.
- 10-5. When asked if any opponents of the application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record no opposition is noted.

- 10-6. When asked if anyone else wants to speak on the application or any other submittals for the record Kathleen comments on the Murray's submitted statements regarding the state of the District's fire hydrants. Mr. Murray explains that his comments span a 10 year time frame and reflect his personal experiences as a volunteer fire fighter in North Routt. President Jim F. closes the public hearing and turns to the Board for any questions that the Board members may have and to discuss the application.

Per C.R.S. 32-1-501(3)

The Board will make a motion based on the findings on these factors:

A-1. The best interest of the (applicant's) property to be excluded is:

The board's findings > To be excluded, because: District has no plan to provide service; development on well and septic would not harm District.

A-2. The best interest of the District is:

The board's findings > For the Property to be excluded, because: Property is remote from District services.

A-3. The best interest of the County is:

The board's findings> For the Property to be excluded, because: County has determined that property does not need public services.

B. Relative cost and benefit to the Property to be excluded from District:

The board's findings> Benefit, slightly lower tax bill.

C. Ability of the District to provide economical and sufficient service to the Property requesting exclusion; to all of the properties in the District:

The board's findings> None to property at present, none in current District plans, would require major change; plan; financing.

D. District ability to provide services at a reasonable cost compared to other entities' ability to provide such services:

The board's findings> District is only entity with ability to provide, unless County finances/policies change.

E. Effect of denying the petition on employment/other economic conditions in the District and surrounding area:

The board's findings> Denial of the petition would continue the status quo; no effect anticipated.

F. Economic impact (on District, surrounding area, state) if petition approved or denied:

The board's findings> If approved, less tax revenue to District; possible increase in tax to other District lots

G. Whether there is an economically feasible alternative service:

The board's findings> No feasible alternative public service provider is known to be available.

H. Additional cost to be levied on other property in the District if exclusion is granted:

The board's findings> Annual tax loss if exclusion is \$ 302.68. (Cumulative cost is to be considered.)

BASED UPON THESE FINDINGS, and other points made in Board discussion, Jim F. moves that we direct our counsel to prepare an Order to **APPROVE** the Petitioner's request for exclusion for the designated property. Dave seconds the motion, four approve, one opposed citing loss of revenue to the District, motion carried.

- 11-1. The Public Hearing is being started for **Ward Thomas Summer & Barbara A. Birdsall.**

- 11-2. Rich Tremaine, attorney for SLWSD, summarizes the application information: Lot 4 Elkhorn subdivision filing 2, 14.95 acres, annual tax amount of \$283.43.

- 11-3. Applicant is not present, no specific statements of support are submitted.
- 11-4. When asked if any supporter of this application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record it was decided that a show of hands in favor of this application is appropriate. 11 public members in attendance are in favor of the application.
- 11-5. When asked if any opponents of the application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record no opposition is noted.
- 11-6. When asked if anyone else wants to speak on the application or any other submittals for the record no further comments are submitted. President Jim F. closes the public hearing and turns to the Board for any questions that the Board members may have and to discuss the application.

Per C.R.S. 32-1-501(3)

The Board will make a motion based on the findings on these factors:

A-1. The best interest of the (applicant's) property to be excluded is:

The board's findings > To be excluded, because: District has no plan to provide service; development on well and septic would not harm District.

A-2. The best interest of the District is:

The board's findings > For the Property to be excluded, because: Property is remote from District services.

A-3. The best interest of the County is:

The board's findings> For the Property to be excluded, because: County has determined that property does not need public services.

B. Relative cost and benefit to the Property to be excluded from District:

The board's findings> Benefit, slightly lower tax bill.

C. Ability of the District to provide economical and sufficient service to the Property requesting exclusion; to all of the properties in the District:

The board's findings> None to property at present, none in current District plans, would require major change; plan; financing.

D. District ability to provide services at a reasonable cost compared to other entities' ability to provide such services:

The board's findings> District is only entity with ability to provide, unless County finances/policies change.

E. Effect of denying the petition on employment/other economic conditions in the District and surrounding area:

The board's findings> Denial of the petition would continue the status quo; no effect anticipated.

F. Economic impact (on District, surrounding area, state) if petition approved or denied:

The board's findings> If approved, less tax revenue to District; possible increase in tax to other District lots

G. Whether there is an economically feasible alternative service:

The board's findings> No feasible alternative public service provider is known to be available.

H. Additional cost to be levied on other property in the District if exclusion is granted:

The board's findings> Annual tax loss if exclusion is \$ 283.43. (Cumulative cost is to be considered.)

BASED UPON THESE FINDINGS, and other points made in Board discussion, Jim H. moves that we direct our counsel to prepare an Order to **APPROVE** the Petitioner's request for exclusion for the designated property. Jim F. seconds the motion, four approve, one opposed siting loss of revenue to the District, motion carried.

- 12-1. The Public Hearing is being started for **Timothy S. Wright & Eleanor W. Wright**.
- 12-2. Rich Tremaine, attorney for SLWSD, summarizes the application information:
Lot 2 Aspen Heights subdivision filing 3, 5.0 acres which has primary residence, annual tax amount of \$394.33; Lot 3 Aspen Heights subdivision filing 3, 5.02 acres which has outbuildings, annual tax amount of \$813.97; Lot 273 filing 7, .25 acre, tax amount \$7.33; Lot 274 filing 7, .25 acre, tax amount \$7.33; Lot 275 filing 7, .25 acre, tax amount \$7.33; Lot 303 filing 7, .54 acre, tax amount \$9.66 for a total of \$1239.95 annually; all lots are adjoining.
- 12-3. Applicant is present, statements of support are submitted for the record. Mr. Wright gives details of his properties and expresses gratitude to the Board for this process and public hearing.
- 12-4. When asked if any supporter of this application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record it was decided that a show of hands in favor of this application is appropriate. 11 public members in attendance are in favor of the application.
- 12-5. When asked if any opponents of the application wish to speak or submit any documentation for the record no opposition is noted.
- 12-6. When asked if anyone else wants to speak on the application or any other submittals for the record no further comments are submitted. President Jim F. closes the public hearing and turns to the Board for any questions that the Board members may have and to discuss the application.

Per C.R.S. 32-1-501(3)

The Board will make a motion based on the findings on these factors:

A-1. The best interest of the (applicant's) property to be excluded is:

The board's findings > To be excluded, because: District has no plan to provide service; development on well and septic would not harm District.

A-2. The best interest of the District is:

The board's findings > For the Property to be excluded, because: Property is remote from District services.

A-3. The best interest of the County is:

The board's findings> For the Property to be excluded, because: County has determined that property does not need public services.

B. Relative cost and benefit to the Property to be excluded from District:

The board's findings> Benefit, slightly lower tax bill.

C. Ability of the District to provide economical and sufficient service to the Property requesting exclusion; to all of the properties in the District:

The board's findings> None to property at present, none in current District plans, would require major change; plan; financing.

D. District ability to provide services at a reasonable cost compared to other entities' ability to provide such services:

The board's findings> District is only entity with ability to provide, unless County finances/policies change.

E. Effect of denying the petition on employment/other economic conditions in the District and surrounding area:

The board's findings> Denial of the petition would continue the status quo; no effect anticipated.

F. Economic impact (on District, surrounding area, state) if petition approved or denied:

The board's findings> If approved, less tax revenue to District; possible increase in tax to other District lots

G. Whether there is an economically feasible alternative service:

The board's findings> No feasible alternative public service provider is known to be available.

H. Additional cost to be levied on other property in the District if exclusion is granted:

The board's findings> Annual tax loss if exclusion is \$ 1239.95. (Cumulative cost is to be considered.)

BASED UPON THESE FINDINGS, and other points made in Board discussion, Jim F. moves that we direct our counsel to prepare an Order to **APPROVE** the Petitioner's request for exclusion for the designated property. Dave seconds the motion, four approve, one opposed siting loss of revenue to the District, motion carried.

KT Law will prepare the requested orders for exclusion for the Board to review and sign at the next regular meeting after final payments are received from petitioners. Jim F. closes the public hearing and the public expresses appreciation for this opportunity.

Next Meeting: Monday, July 11th, 2016 at 6:00pm with executive session beginning at 5:00 to discuss the exclusion items with legal counsel at North Routt Fire Station #2

Meeting adjourned

at 7:24pm by Kathleen Titus

Minutes recorded by Jackie Johnson

Board Minutes approved: July 11, 2016